XX. On the Insect called Oistros by the Ancient Greeks, and Asilus by the Romans. By William Sharp MacLeay, Esq., M.A. F.L.S. Communicated by the Zoological Club of the Linnean Society.

## Read March 16, 1824.

**THE** determination of the animals and plants mentioned by the ancient writers must always be a pleasing subject of research, tending, as it does, not merely to our better comprehension of the meaning of these authors, but also to our better acquaintance with the mysteries of nature. Every classical reader, as well as every entomologist, is familiar with the word *Oestrus* as the name of one of the most celebrated insects of antiquity. The insect itself, however,

" cui nomen Asilo " Romanum est, Œstron Graii vertere vocantes,"

VIRG. Georg. iii. 147.

has not for this been the more accurately determined; and Olivier is the first modern naturalist who appears to have suspected that the *Œstrus* of the ancients and the *Œstrus* of the moderns are totally different insects. With an exception in favour of Messrs. Latreille, Kirby and Spence, this curious remark seems not to have excited much attention; although it may easily be proved, that Olivier has come much nearer the truth than those who hold the contrary opinion.

In investigations of the following nature, it is not only advantageous but necessary to begin from some fixed and indisputable position. Now such I take to be the identity of the insects termed in French *taon*; in Spanish *tavano*; in Italian *tabano*; and

and in Latin tabanus. The tabani are unfortunately insects too common for their name to have ever been forgotten; and knowing what the country people in France call taons, we know the insects which Pliny anciently termed tabani. By comparing Pliny with Aristotle, we find that he invariably translates the word wind (cacutiens) by the Latin word tabanus; and entomologists know well that this Greek name is extremely appropriate to the modern tabani or taons, which are so remarkable for their eves, that a common species of Chrysops has at the present day the trivial epithet of *cacutiens*. Now it appears from Aristotle, that the olorgos \* and wow were insects extremely near each other in affinity; they are almost always mentioned by him together, and agree in every respect but that wherein Aristotle was least likely to be accurate, namely, their mode of generation. In description they always accord; they are both diptera, and therefore he says necessarily έμπροσθόκεντρα, "ούδεν δ'έστι δίπτερον όπισθόxevreov." Now this, by the way, proves not only that the olorgos was not the modern Œstrus, but moreover that Aristotle could never have seen a modern *Œstrus* attack cattle; for had he seen it, he would most assuredly have deemed it on robinerreos. And yet he must have seen his olorgos about cattle ; for he states positively not only that the viore of pierce the hides of quadrupeds, but that they are armed with a strong tongue, and are blood-suckers (autoboea Zaa). In both these last respects it is to be observed, that they differ totally from the modern *Œstrus*, but perfectly agree, as M. Latreille has well said, with the Linnæan Tabani.

Ælian describes the orress and  $\mu \dot{\nu} \omega \psi$  in the same way as Aristotle. They are both most inimical to cattle ( $\beta o \nu \sigma \dot{\nu} \, \ddot{\epsilon} \chi \theta \sigma \sigma \alpha$ ). The orress he states to be one of the largest flies ( $\varkappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \mu \nu \dot{\tau} \alpha \varsigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \varsigma \mu \nu \dot{\tau} \alpha \varsigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \varsigma$ ), having a strong sting in its mouth, and uttering a

\* Olorgos is a name also applied by Aristotle to some small insectivorous bird, and to some species of the *Cymothoadæ*, which is parasitical about the fins of the Tunny. Pliny also appears to apply the word *Estrus* to the drone (lib. ii. c. 16.).

particular

particular kind of harsh humming noise ( $\tilde{\eta}\chi or \beta o\mu \mathcal{E}\omega \delta\eta \tau iv \lambda \pi \alpha \lambda$  $\tau g \alpha \chi \dot{\nu} \nu$ ). The  $\mu \dot{\nu} \omega \psi$ , on the other hand, he says is like the fly called by the Greeks  $\pi v \nu \dot{\rho} \mu \nu i \alpha$ ; and although it makes a louder hum than the  $o''_{i}\sigma \tau g o \varsigma$ , he states that it has a smaller sting.

If we now turn to the poets, we shall find that their account of this insect tallies perfectly with the above description of the ancient naturalists, but not at all with the modern genus Œstrus.

Homer describes his  $\mathcal{C}strus$  as  $\dot{\alpha}_{i\delta\lambda\sigma\varsigma}$ , a word which applies admirably to the most common of all *Tabanida*, namely the *Taba*nus pluvialis of Linnæus, as well as to the insects which now form the genus *Chrysops*. And the Scholiast, after stating that the  $\sigma_{i\sigma\tau\varsigma\sigma\varsigma}$  and  $\mu\dot{\omega}\omega\psi$  are very near in affinity, says that the latter differs in having a smaller sting in the mouth, and in being subæneous in respect to its aspect or facies ( $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\dot{\sigma}\chi\alpha\lambda\pi\sigma\nu\tau\tau\dot{\eta}\nu\mu\sigma\varsigma\phi\dot{\eta}\nu$ ), thus evidently pointing, as I think, to the difference which exists between the modern genera *Tabanus* and *Hæmatopota*, the latter having much more splendid eyes. That Homer's insect was not the modern  $\mathcal{C}strus$  may besides be inferred from what he says of the season in which it makes its appearance,

# " <sup>π</sup>Ωρη ἐν εἰαρινῆ, ότε τ' ἦματα μαχρά πέλονται"

for there are few cases, I believe, of the modern *Œstri* appearing earlier than the middle of July. And this circumstance, by the way, leads also to the conclusion, that the English *breese* or *brize* is not the modern *Œstrus*, although it is generally understood so to signify in the following punning lines of Shakespeare :

#### " Cleopatra,

The breeze upon her, like a cow in June, Hoists sail and flies."

Now Mouffet, who, both as an entomological observer and as a contemporary of Shakespeare, was likely to know the insect then named *brize*, says expressly that the *breeze*, *clegg*, *clingez* VOL. XIV. 3 A and and taon, are all the same insect, his description of which proves it to be no other than the *Hæmatopota pluvialis*, for which the *Clegg* remains to this day the well-known and appropriate provincial name—a name totally inapplicable to the modern *Œstrus*.

I have before said, that Aristotle makes it quite evident that his  $o''_{0}\sigma\tau_{0}\sigma_{2}$  and  $\mu \dot{v}\omega \psi$  were very nearly of the same construction. So near indeed in affinity do they appear to have been, that Æschylus would seem to consider them as identical in his Prometheus vinctus. From this poet we learn, that they are  $\dot{c}\xi \dot{v}\sigma\tau_{0}\mu\omega_{1}$ , and pierce the skin. Io says,

### " Οἰστεήλατῷ δὲ δέgματι δειλαίαν Παράχοπον ὦδε τείρεις;"

In short, wherever the wind is distinguished from the olorgos, I take the former to be either a Chrysops or Hamatopota\*, or some insect near to them, and the latter to be some species of the modern genus Tabanus, probably the Tabanus bovinus Linn. or dun-fly, whose power of agitating cattle I have myself had occasion to witness. This last insect certainly appears to be the Asilus and Estrus of Virgil. That this poet's insect cannot be identical with any modern Œstrus is clear from his describing it to be in great plenty, and to be "acerba sonans." Now the Estrus bovis is very rare every where; and, according to Mr. B. Clark, makes no noise. The Œstrus equi is also silent in flying, as I have repeatedly myself observed. So that neither of these insects can be that which is celebrated by Virgil, whose description of the ability of the ancient olorgos to make a particular kind of humming noise is corroborated by the Scholiast before mentioned as well as by Ælian.

\* One circumstance which is mentioned by Ælian respecting the *Myops*, namely, that it makes a louder hum than the *Œstrus*, is perhaps against its identity with the modern genus *Hamatopota*.

Messrs.

356

Messrs. Kirby and Spence in their Introduction to Entomology think that the ancient Myops was some species of Latreille's genus Tabanus, and that the Œstrus of the Greeks may either have been a Pangonia or a Nemestrina. What we know, however, of the latter genus answers in no one respect to the description above given of the ancient Œstrus, which certainly was an insect allied to the modern Tabanus; whereas Nemestrina has no immediate connexion with it either in economy or structure. Besides, no Nemestrina has ever yet been found in Europe. The argument for Pangonia is rather stronger, as this is not only an European genus, but one nearly allied to Tabanus. Aristotle however says, that his Œstrus and Myops have both a strong tongue (ἰσχυραν γλῶτταν έχουσι); a description in perfect accord with the mouth of a modern Tabanus, but quite at variance with the long, weak and flexible proboscis of Pangonia, which can scarcely be supposed capable of piercing the hide of an ox. Olivier and Latreille indeed both state, that the long trunk of Pangonia, like that of *Bombylius*, only serves for sucking flowers. But to insects that suck flowers Aristotle expressly places his olorgos in opposition.

It is rather interesting to remark the manner in which the early modern naturalists viewed this subject. Mouffet's opinion is, as far as I can make it out, the same with mine given above. At all events he considers the  $\mu \acute{\omega} \omega \psi$  of the Greeks to be our *Hæmatopota pluvialis*. Ray, on the other hand, considers this insect to be the olorgos, as we may judge from the following description, "Musca bipennis Æstrum dicta, alis membranaceis punctis crebris nigrioribus velut adspersis :" which is clearly the *Hæmatopota*.

Valisnieri appears to have been the first naturalist of any repute who took the modern *Œstrus* to be that of Virgil, while Martyn and other commentators seem to have adopted his opinion. The

3 A 2

first

first insect, which Linnæus considered to be the *Œstrus* of the ancients, appears to have been a species of the modern genus *Asilus*, probably the *Asilus crabroniformis*, as we learn from his *Lachesis Lapponica*. This was a gross error; and he soon rectified it, as he thought, by adopting the opinion of Valisnieri. It is not indeed unlikely that some of the ancients\* should, like Valisnieri, have seen the perfect insects of the modern *Œstrus* flying about cattle, and that they should have witnessed the extraordinary agitation which they produce: but however this may be, they certainly appear to have always confounded such insects with the more common *Tabani*; for it is the modern *Tabanus*, or some genus extremely near to it, that they have always described as the ological states.

I shall take this opportunity of quoting a passage from Mouffet, which proves that he was acquainted with the modern genus *Œstrus*, although he did not confound it with the ancient olorgos. The passage will also show us how valuable is the information sometimes to be procured from this obsolete work; since, if we connect it with what Reaumur has said of the *Œstrus equi*, we have almost the whole economy of this interesting insect:

"His proximè accedit alia musca bobus et jumentis interdiu sole fervido infesta, quam Pennius Curvicaudam sive σχολιουgòv jure appellat. Semper enim cruribus aut ventri jumenti insidens, caudam versus ipsam recurvam tenet et spiculum exertum quo ad percutiendum cauda sit paratior (δίπτερον ὀπισθόπευτρον).

\* Aristotle was not certainly one of these ancients; for he could never have seen a female of the modern Estrus, as appears from his stating that no dipterous insect has its sting placed behind. It seems however to have escaped the notice of naturalists, that this great philosopher was acquainted with, and has described the larva of one of the modern family of Estrida; and, as is rather singular, precisely that larva which Reaumur describes as infesting the fauces of the stag, but of which the perfect insect remains still unascertained.—See Arist. Hist. Anim. lib. ii. c. 18; and Reaum. tom. v. 67-77.

Hanc

### called Oistros and Asilus by the Ancients.

Hanc Angli a Whame and a Burrell-flye proprie vocant, nec nisi in Angliâ facile invenitur. Musca hæc api fere similis formâ et colore, sed corpore est crassiore. Non adhæret nec sanguinem sugit sed solummodo stimulo in caudâ pungit, atque ut equos affligat per longissima itinera ipsos volando persequitur. Equi naturâ hanc muscam timent et ad ejus solum contactum quasi horrent, caudâ pedibusque et labiis tam cruentum hostem abigere sæpe conantes. Sunt qui putant hanc muscam non aculeo pungere, sed stercora (ova) pilis equi affigere caudâ, unde posteà molestissimæ lendes gignuntur. Magno quidem impetu sed cæco ad prædam Tabanus atque  $\Sigma$ xoluvgôs feruntur." p. 62.

359

XXI. Some